

The symmetry energy γ parameter of relativistic mean-field models

Mariana Dutra

Departamento de Ciências da Natureza, Universidade Federal Fluminense, 28895-532, Rio das Ostras, RJ, Brazil

Odilon Lourenço

Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 27930-560, Macaé, RJ, Brazil

Or Hen

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA

Eliezer Piasetzky

School of Physics and Astronomy, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel

Débora P. Menezes

*Depto de Física - CFM - Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina,
Florianópolis - SC - CP. 476 - CEP 88.040-900, Brazil*

(Dated: October 7, 2018)

The relativistic mean-field models tested in previous works against nuclear matter experimental values, critical parameters and macroscopic stellar properties are revisited and used in the evaluation of the symmetry energy γ parameter obtained in three different ways. We have checked that independent of the choice made to calculate the γ values, a trend of linear correlation is observed between γ and the symmetry energy (S_0) and a more clear linear relationship is established between γ and the slope of the symmetry energy (L_0). These results directly contribute to the arising of other linear correlations between γ and the neutron star radii of $R_{1.0}$ and $R_{1.4}$, in agreement with recent findings. Finally, we have found that short-range correlations induce two specific parametrizations, namely, IU-FSU and DD-ME δ , simultaneously compatible with the neutron star mass constraint of $1.93 \leq M_{\max}/M_{\odot} \leq 2.05$ and with the overlap band for the $L_0 \times S_0$ region, to present γ in the range of $\gamma = 0.25 \pm 0.05$.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the introduction of the first models in nuclear physics, the main idea was to describe experimental data. Not all nuclear models can be applied to the description of nuclear matter but they are relevant nevertheless. Relativistic mean field (RMF) models were developed to describe observables of nuclei, from which nuclear matter parameters can be extracted.

A detailed analysis of 263 RMF models based on pure neutron and symmetric nuclear matter properties was done in Ref. [1] and only 35 of them were shown to satisfy important nuclear constraints. In a subsequent work, these models were used to analyse stellar properties related to largely studied astrophysical quantities, namely, neutron star masses and radii of the canonical neutron stars (obtained from observational data), the possible onset of the Direct Urca process and sound velocity constraints [2]. As a result, only 13 out of them produced neutron stars with maximum mass in the range of $1.93 \leq M_{\max}/M_{\odot} \leq 2.05$ [3, 4] as far as no hyperons were considered, namely, one with density dependent couplings (DD-F) and one also incorporating scalar-isovector δ mesons (DD-ME δ). The remaining parametrizations (BKA20, BKA22, BKA24, BSR8, BSR9, BSR10, BSR11, BSR12, FSUGZ03, IU-FSU, G2*) present constant couplings, nonlinear σ and ω terms, and cross terms involving these fields. None of them could reproduce pulsars

with $2M_{\odot}$ if hyperons were included. More recently, the same models were revisited and their critical parameters were obtained [5]. These critical parameters are the critical temperature, critical pressure and critical density, at which nuclear matter is no longer unstable and the liquid-gas phase transition ceases to exist [6–12]. In this investigation, the models were divided into 6 categories (BKA, BSR, FSU, G2*, Z271 and DD). More experimental data is necessary, but so far, only two of them (Z271 and DD) provided critical temperatures close to existing ones. A clear correlation between the critical temperature and the compressibility was obtained. More details on these models are given along the paper.

In the same context, the symmetry energy [13] and its slope are very important quantities and in the last fifteen years, they were shown to be correlated with a series of physical properties, which we comment next. The symmetry energy is related to the nuclei neutron skin thickness, which in turn is related to neutron star radius: models that yield smaller neutron skin thickness in heavy nuclei, give rise to smaller neutron star radii [14]. On the other hand, neutron skins are larger for models with higher slope [15]. Also, a strong correlation was observed between the neutron star radius and the variation of the slope at sub-threshold densities [16]. The symmetry energy and the slope, however, can be easily controlled by the inclusion of a $\omega - \rho$ [15, 17–19] or a $\sigma - \rho$ interaction [20] in non-linear models. The larger

the value of the $\omega - \rho$ interaction, for instance, the lower the values of the symmetry energy and its slope. On the other hand, for density dependent models a change in the density dependence of the ρ -meson coupling can modify the symmetry energy and its slope.

Besides the neutron skin thickness, the neutron star crust-core properties are also correlated with the slope of the symmetry energy, a fact that had already been observed in studies involving liquid-gas phase transitions, whose transition densities are approximately the same as the ones obtained as the separating densities from the pasta phase to homogeneous matter [21].

We next reanalyze the parametrizations studied in Ref. [1], that we call *consistent relativistic mean field* (CRMF) models from now on. In this context, the word “consistent” refers to those parametrizations that were shown to satisfy the nuclear matter constraints in Ref. [1]. For these CRMF parametrizations, we evaluate the symmetry energy coefficient γ in three different cases. Such a quantity is defined from $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^{kin} + \mathcal{S}^{pot}$, with $\mathcal{S}^{pot}(\rho) \propto (\rho/\rho_0)^\gamma$ and was first analyzed in Refs. [22, 23]. Our aim is to look for possible correlations between the γ parameter and some important nuclear matter and neutron star properties, namely the symmetry energy, its slope, and the radii of 1.0 and 1.4 solar mass neutron stars. Within the assumptions made in the present work, the γ parameter fully defines the potential part of the symmetry energy and its density dependence. Theoretically, γ is sensitive to the nucleon-nucleon interaction at very short distances and can be extracted from the existing calculations. We also investigate which parametrizations satisfy the ranges of γ recently obtained in Refs. [24, 25]. It is worth pointing out that from the experimental side, the γ parameter is not directly measured but, as most of the bulk nuclear matter properties, it can be inferred from experiments. In order to be consistent with previous studies, the $\omega - \rho$ and $\sigma - \rho$ interactions that can be included in most models to *cure* their symmetry energy and slope values are left aside. They are just considered in the models that introduced them when they were proposed.

This paper is organized as follows: the introduction is exhibited in Sec. 1. In Sec. 2, the formalism is introduced and three different forms of separate kinetic and potential parts of the symmetry energy are presented. In Sec. 3 the results are discussed. The summary is shown in Sec. 4.

II. FORMALISM

The analysis performed in Ref. [1] pointed out to only 35 parametrizations, out of 263 investigated, simultaneously approved in seven distinct nuclear matter constraints. These CRMF parametrizations had their bulk and thermodynamical quantities compared to respective theoretical/experimental data from symmetric nuclear matter (SNM), pure neutron matter (PNM), and a mixture of both, namely, symmetry energy and its slope eval-

uated at the saturation density, and the ratio of the symmetry energy at $\rho_0/2$ to its value at ρ_0 (MIX). These detailed constraints are specified in Table I.

TABLE I. Set of updated constraints (SET2a) used in Ref. [1]. See that reference for more details.

Constraint	Quantity	Density Region	Range
SM1	K_0	at ρ_0	190 – 270 MeV
SM3a	$P(\rho)$	$2 < \frac{\rho}{\rho_0} < 5$	Band Region
SM4	$P(\rho)$	$1.2 < \frac{\rho}{\rho_0} < 2.2$	Band Region
PNM1	\mathcal{E}_{PNM}/ρ	$0.017 < \frac{\rho}{\rho_0} < 0.108$	Band Region
MIX1a	J	at ρ_0	25 – 35 MeV
MIX2a	L_0	at ρ_0	25 – 115 MeV
MIX4	$\frac{S(\rho_0/2)}{J}$	at ρ_0 and $\rho_0/2$	0.57 – 0.86

In Table II we present a brief compilation of the structure and methods used in fitting the finite range RMF interactions in accordance with the macroscopic constraints, and the data used for the fittings. For full explanation and details, we address the readers to the original papers and for a complete description of the relativistic mean-field theory, to Ref. [26].

Thirty out of the 35 parametrizations approved in matching the constraints analyzed in Ref. [1] are of type 4, i.e., the Lagrangian density includes nonlinear σ and ω terms and cross terms involving these fields. They are: BKA20, BKA22, BKA24, BSR8, BSR9, BSR10, BSR11, BSR12, BSR15, BSR16, BSR17, BSR18, BSR19, BSR20, FSU-III, FSU-IV, FSUGold, FSUGold4, FSUGZ03, FSUGZ06, G2*, IU-FSU, Z271s2, Z271s3, Z271s4, Z271s5, Z271s6, Z271v4, Z271v5, and Z271v6. They are described by the following Lagrangian density,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{NL} = & \bar{\psi}(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - M)\psi + g_\sigma \sigma \bar{\psi}\psi - g_\omega \bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu \omega_\mu \psi \\
& - \frac{g_\rho}{2} \bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu \vec{\rho}_\mu \vec{\tau}\psi + \frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu \sigma \partial_\mu \sigma - m_\sigma^2 \sigma^2) - \frac{A}{3} \sigma^3 \\
& - \frac{B}{4} \sigma^4 - \frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} m_\omega^2 \omega_\mu \omega^\mu + \frac{C}{4} (g_\omega^2 \omega_\mu \omega^\mu)^2 \\
& - \frac{1}{4} \vec{B}^{\mu\nu} \vec{B}_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} m_\rho^2 \vec{\rho}_\mu \vec{\rho}^\mu + \frac{1}{2} \alpha'_3 g_\omega^2 g_\rho^2 \omega_\mu \omega^\mu \vec{\rho}_\mu \vec{\rho}^\mu \\
& + g_\sigma g_\omega^2 \sigma \omega_\mu \omega^\mu \left(\alpha_1 + \frac{1}{2} \alpha'_1 g_\sigma \sigma \right) \\
& + g_\sigma g_\rho^2 \sigma \vec{\rho}_\mu \vec{\rho}^\mu \left(\alpha_2 + \frac{1}{2} \alpha'_2 g_\sigma \sigma \right), \tag{1}
\end{aligned}$$

with $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\nu \omega_\mu - \partial_\mu \omega_\nu$ and $\vec{B}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\nu \vec{\rho}_\mu - \partial_\mu \vec{\rho}_\nu$. The nucleon rest mass is M and the meson masses are m_j , for $j = \sigma, \omega$, and ρ .

Other four CRMF approved parametrizations are density dependent (DD): DD-F, TW99, DDH δ and DD-ME δ . Their Lagrangian density reads:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{DD} = & \bar{\psi}(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - M)\psi + \Gamma_\sigma(\rho) \sigma \bar{\psi}\psi - \Gamma_\omega(\rho) \bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu \omega_\mu \psi \\
& - \frac{\Gamma_\rho(\rho)}{2} \bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu \vec{\rho}_\mu \vec{\tau}\psi + \Gamma_\delta(\rho) \bar{\psi}\vec{\delta}\vec{\tau}\psi - \frac{1}{4} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} \\
& + \frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu \sigma \partial_\mu \sigma - m_\sigma^2 \sigma^2) + \frac{1}{2} m_\omega^2 \omega_\mu \omega^\mu - \frac{1}{4} \vec{B}^{\mu\nu} \vec{B}_{\mu\nu} \\
& + \frac{1}{2} m_\rho^2 \vec{\rho}_\mu \vec{\rho}^\mu + \frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu \vec{\delta} \partial_\mu \vec{\delta} - m_\delta^2 \vec{\delta}^2), \tag{2}
\end{aligned}$$

TABLE II. Structure of the RMF models and data used for fitting the finite range parametrizations considered in the present work. NL: nonlinear model. DD: density dependent model. NAP: number of adjusted parameters. AT: additional terms in comparison with the standard nonlinear $\sigma^3 - \sigma^4$ model with meson ρ included.

Parametrization	Type of model, n ^o of parameters, NAP, AT	Data used for fitting purposes
BKA20, BKA22, BKA24 [27]	NL, 12, 10 AT: $\omega^2, \sigma - \omega^2, \sigma^2 - \omega^2, \sigma - \rho^2$	Constraint properties of asymmetric nuclear matter for 26 different parametrizations: binding energies, charge radii for closed shell nuclei, neutron-skin thickness in the ^{208}Pb nucleus: 0.20, 0.22, and 0.24 fm.
BSR8 to BSR12 [28]	NL, 14, 11 AT: $\omega^2, \sigma - \omega^2, \sigma^2 - \omega^2, \sigma - \rho^2,$ $\sigma^2 - \rho^2, \omega^2 - \rho^2$	Binding energies: $^{16,24}\text{O}, ^{40,48}\text{Ca}, ^{56,78}\text{Ni}, ^{88}\text{Sr}, ^{90}\text{Zr}, ^{100,116,132}\text{Sn},$ and ^{208}Pb nuclei, charge radii: $^{16}\text{O}, ^{40,48}\text{Ca}, ^{56}\text{Ni}, ^{88}\text{Sr}, ^{90}\text{Zr}, ^{116}\text{Sn},$ and ^{208}Pb nuclei neutron skin thickness: ^{208}Pb free parameters: neutron-skin thickness $\Delta R = 0.16, 0.18, \dots, 0.28$ fm and the ω -meson self-coupling strength $\xi_0 = 0.03$
BSR15 to BSR20 [28]	NL, 14, 11 AT: $\omega^2, \sigma - \omega^2, \sigma^2 - \omega^2, \sigma - \rho^2,$ $\sigma^2 - \rho^2, \omega^2 - \rho^2$	The same as BSR8-BSR12 with $\xi_0 = 0.06$
FSU-III, FSU-IV[29]	NL, 10, 7 AT: $\omega^2, \omega^2 - \rho^2$	Properties of asymmetric nuclear matter; the proton fraction in β -stable $npe\mu$ matter; the core-crust transition density and pressure in neutron stars as predicted by FSUGold and IU-FSU; free parameters: the coupling constants between the isovector ρ meson (Λ_v) and the isoscalar σ and ω mesons (Λ_s): FSU-III: $\Lambda_v = 0.00$ and $\Lambda_s = 0.02$ FSU-IV: $\Lambda_v = 0.00$ and $\Lambda_s = 0.04$
FSUGold [30]	NL, 10, 8 AT: $\omega^2, \omega^2 - \rho^2$	Binding energies and charge radii magic nuclei for $^{40}\text{Ca}, ^{90}\text{Zr},$ $^{116,132}\text{Sn}, ^{208}\text{Pb}$
FSUGold4 [31]	NL, 10, 8, AT: $\omega^2, \omega^2 - \rho^2$	Adjusting the isovector parameters of the model g_ρ and Λ_v
FSUGZ03, FSUGZ06 [32]	NL, 14, 12 AT: $\omega^2, \sigma - \omega^2, \sigma^2 - \omega^2, \sigma - \rho^2,$ $\sigma^2 - \rho^2, \omega^2 - \rho^2$	Binding energies: $^{16,24}\text{O}, ^{40,48}\text{Ca}, ^{56,78}\text{Ni}, ^{88}\text{Sr}, ^{90}\text{Zr},$ $^{100,116,132}\text{Sn}, ^{208}\text{Pb}$ charge rms radii: $^{16}\text{O}, ^{40,48}\text{Ca}, ^{56}\text{Ni}, ^{88}\text{Sr}, ^{90}\text{Zr}, ^{116}\text{Sn}, ^{208}\text{Pb}$ neutron-skin thickness for ^{208}Pb nucleus: 0.18 ± 0.01 fm free parameters: ζ and ξ corresponding to self-couplings for ω and ρ mesons: $\zeta = 0.03, 0.06$ and $\xi = 0$
G2* [33]	NL, 12, 10 AT: $\omega^2, \sigma - \omega^2, \sigma^2 - \omega^2, \sigma - \rho^2$	Adjust the isovector-vector channel of the G2 parameter set.
IU-FSU [34]	NL, 10, 10 AT: $\omega^2, \omega^2 - \rho^2$	Change the isoscalar parameter to $\xi = 0.03$; refitting of the isoscalar parameters to maintain the saturation properties of SNM of FSU; increase the isoscalar-isovector coupling constant to $\Lambda = 0.046$
Z271s2 to Z271s5 [35]	NL, 10, 8 AT: $\omega^2, \sigma^2 - \rho^2$	Model parameters used: Z271 free parameters: $\lambda_v = 0$ and $\lambda_s = 0.020, 0.030, 0.040, 0.050$
Z271v4 to Z271v6 [35]	NL, 10, 8 AT: $\omega^2, \omega^2 - \rho^2$	The same as Z271s2-s5, but the free parameters are: $\lambda_s = 0$ and $\lambda_v = 0.020, 0.25, 0.030$
DD-F [36]	DD, 15, 12	Properties of finite nuclei: binding energies, charge and diffraction radii, surface thicknesses, neutron skin in ^{208}Pb , spin-orbit splittings
TW99 [37]	DD, 15, 12	Fix the density dependence of the couplings from Dirac-Brueckner calculations of nuclear matter binding energies of symmetric nuclei ($^{16}\text{O}, ^{40}\text{Ca}, ^{56}\text{Ni}$) and neutron-rich nuclei ($^{24}\text{O}, ^{48}\text{Ca}, ^{90}\text{Zr}, ^{208}\text{Pb}$).
DDH δ [38]	DD, 20, 16	Reproduce bulk asymmetry parameter $a_4 = 33.4$ MeV
DD-ME δ [39]	DD, 24, 14	Finite nuclei and adjustment to ab initio calculations in infinite nuclear matter

where

$$\Gamma_i(\rho) = \Gamma_i(\rho_0) f_i(x); \quad f_i(x) = a_i \frac{1 + b_i(x + d_i)^2}{1 + c_i(x + e_i)^2}, \quad (3)$$

for $i = \sigma, \omega$, and $x = \rho/\rho_0$. For the ρ coupling one has

$$\Gamma_\rho(\rho) = \Gamma_\rho(\rho_0) e^{-a_\rho(x-1)}. \quad (4)$$

The Lagrangian density describing the DD-F and TW99 parametrizations is the same as the one in Eq. (2) when

the meson δ is not taken into account. For the DD-ME δ parametrization, the couplings in Eq. (3) are valid for $i = \sigma, \omega, \rho$, and δ . Finally, the DDH δ model has the same coupling parameters as in Eq. (3) for the mesons σ and ω , but functions $f_i(x)$ given by

$$f_i(x) = a_i e^{-b_i(x-1)} - c_i(x - d_i), \quad (5)$$

for $i = \rho, \delta$.

Only one parametrization belongs to the nonlinear

point coupling category, namely, the FA3 [40]. In this kind of model, nucleons interact with each other without explicitly including mesons [41–44]. Here, we do not investigate such model since in Ref [2] we have shown it is not capable of generating a mass radius curve for neutron stars, due to a very particular behavior in the high-density regime, namely, a fall in the pressure versus energy density (\mathcal{E}) curve near $\mathcal{E} = 809$ MeV/fm³. For that reason, we have decided to discard this particular parametrization.

All the details about the RMF approximation and related equations of state (EoS) are given in Ref. [1] and will not be repeated here. Only the formulae necessary for the understanding of the present analysis are defined next.

The general definition of the symmetry energy reads as follows,

$$\mathcal{S}(\rho) = \frac{1}{8} \left. \frac{\partial^2 (\mathcal{E}/\rho)}{\partial y^2} \right|_{\rho, y=1/2} = \mathcal{S}^{kin}(\rho) + \mathcal{S}^{pot}(\rho), \quad (6)$$

where $y = \rho_p/\rho$ is the proton fraction of the system with ρ_p being the proton density. By using such an expression, we compute the kinetic and potential contributions of the symmetry energy slope

$$\begin{aligned} L(\rho) &= 3\rho \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}}{\partial \rho} = 3\rho \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}^{kin}}{\partial \rho} + 3\rho \frac{\partial \mathcal{S}^{pot}}{\partial \rho} \\ &= L^{kin}(\rho) + L^{pot}(\rho). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

If we consider the potential part of the symmetry energy written as a power-law in density according to

$$\mathcal{S}^{pot}(\rho) = \mathcal{S}_0^{pot}(\rho/\rho_0)^\gamma \equiv \mathcal{S}_{\text{approx.}}^{pot}(\rho), \quad (8)$$

it is possible to express L_0 as

$$L_0 = 3\rho_0 \left[\left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{S}^{kin}}{\partial \rho} \right)_{\rho=\rho_0} + \frac{\gamma}{\rho_0} \mathcal{S}_0^{pot} \right]. \quad (9)$$

By using Eq. (7) at $\rho = \rho_0$ and comparing it to Eq. (9), one can find γ as in Ref. [24], namely,

$$\gamma = \frac{L_0 - L_0^{kin}}{3\mathcal{S}_0^{pot}} = \frac{L_0^{pot}}{3\mathcal{S}_0^{pot}}, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_0^{kin,pot} = \mathcal{F}^{kin,pot}(\rho_0)$, for $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{S}, L$. In that reference [24], the authors also introduced effects from short-range correlations (SRC) between proton-neutron pairs [48–50] in symmetric nuclear matter in order to provide an analytical expression for the kinetic part of the symmetry energy. From this expression, that we will also use in Sec. 2.3, they found the range of -10 ± 7.5 MeV for the kinetic part of the symmetry energy at the saturation density, \mathcal{S}_0^{kin} , based on data from free proton-to-neutron ratios measured in intermediate energy nucleus-nucleus collisions. Such a range allowed the authors to predict the values of $\gamma = 0.25 \pm 0.05$.

Another proposition for the calculation of the γ value is given in Ref. [25], where no short-range correlations

in the kinetic part of the symmetry energy is taken into account. In that case, the density dependence of the symmetry energy was given by

$$\mathcal{S}(\rho) = \mathcal{S}^{kin}(\rho) + \mathcal{S}^{pot}(\rho) = a(\rho/\rho_0)^{2/3} + b(\rho/\rho_0)^\gamma, \quad (11)$$

with $a = 12$ MeV, $b = 22$ MeV, and γ possibly ranging from 0.5 to 1.5 corresponding respectively to a soft and a stiff dependence. In that paper [25], a constraint for the nuclear symmetry energy at suprasaturation densities was deduced from ASY-EOS experiment at GSI at twice saturation density, where the measurement of the elliptic flows of neutrons and light-charged particles in a gold-gold reaction resulted in $\gamma = 0.72 \pm 0.19$.

A. Complete kinetic term (case 1)

Here we considered the *complete* kinetic term for the different models. Within this assumption, the first term of the symmetry energy is the kinetic part and the remaining is treated as the potential part. For the kinetic part, the corresponding expressions for nonlinear and density dependent (with δ meson) RMF models are,

$$\mathcal{S}_i^{kin}(\rho) = \frac{k_F^2}{6E_{F_i}^*} \quad (12)$$

where $i = \text{NL}, \text{DD}$, with $E_{F_i}^* = (k_F^2 + M_i^{*2})^{1/2}$ and

$$M_{\text{NL}}^* = M - g_\sigma \sigma, \quad M_{\text{DD}}^* = M - \Gamma_\sigma(\rho)\sigma, \quad (13)$$

for symmetric matter ($y = 1/2$). The Fermi momentum is written in term of density as $k_F = (3\pi^2\rho/2)^{1/3}$.

The potential part of the symmetry energy is written as

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{NL}}^{pot}(\rho) = \frac{g_\rho^2}{8m_\rho^{*2}}\rho, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{DD}}^{pot}(\rho) = \frac{\Gamma_\rho^2 \rho}{8m_\rho^2} - \frac{(\Gamma_\delta/m_\delta)^2 (M_{\text{DD}}^*)^2 \rho}{2E_{F_{\text{DD}}}^{*2} \left[1 + \left(\frac{\Gamma_\delta}{m_\delta} \right)^2 A_{\text{DD}} \right]}, \quad (15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} m_\rho^{*2} &= m_\rho^2 + g_\sigma g_\rho^2 \sigma (2\alpha_2 + \alpha_2' g_\sigma \sigma) + \alpha_3' g_\omega^2 g_\rho^2 \omega_0^2, \text{ and} \quad (16) \\ A_{\text{DD}} &= \frac{2}{\pi^2} \int_0^{k_F} \frac{k^4 dk}{[k^2 + (M_{\text{DD}}^*)^2]^{3/2}} = 3 \left(\frac{\rho_s}{M_{\text{DD}}^*} - \frac{\rho}{E_{F_{\text{DD}}}^*} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The mean-field value of the vector field ω_μ is ω_0 , and ρ_s is the scalar density.

The respective expressions for the different contributions of the symmetry energy slope, namely, $L^{kin}(\rho)$ and $L^{pot}(\rho)$, are obtained as indicated in Eq. (7), for this case and the next ones.

B. “Free” kinetic term (case 2)

In this case we have separated the *really kinetic term*, the one without any dependence of the interaction with the mesons, from the rest of the symmetry energy. The expressions in this case read

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{NL}}^{\text{kin}}(\rho) = \mathcal{S}_{\text{DD}}^{\text{kin}}(\rho) = \frac{k_F^2}{6E_F}, \quad (18)$$

with $E_F = (k_F^2 + M^2)^{1/2}$, for the kinetic part, and

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{NL}}^{\text{pot}}(\rho) = \frac{k_F^2}{6E_{F_{\text{NL}}}^*} - \frac{k_F^2}{6E_F} + \frac{g_\rho^2}{8m_\rho^{*2}}\rho, \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\text{DD}}^{\text{pot}}(\rho) &= \frac{k_F^2}{6E_{F_{\text{DD}}}^*} - \frac{k_F^2}{6E_F} + \frac{\Gamma_\rho^2 \rho}{8m_\rho^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{(\Gamma_\delta/m_\delta)^2 (M_{\text{DD}}^*)^2 \rho}{2E_{F_{\text{DD}}}^{*2} \left[1 + \left(\frac{\Gamma_\delta}{m_\delta} \right)^2 A_{\text{DD}} \right]}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

for the potential one.

C. Short range correlations (case 3)

The idea here is to replace the kinetic part of the symmetry energy by that one proposed in Ref. [24], where the authors have considered \mathcal{S}^{kin} as composed by a free gas model term added to a correction term $\Delta\mathcal{S}^{\text{kin}}$ that takes into account short-range correlations between proton-neutron pairs in symmetric nuclear matter. Based on this procedure, we calculate the potential part of the symmetry energy as follows,

$$\mathcal{S}_i^{\text{pot}}(\rho) = \mathcal{S}_i(\rho) - \mathcal{S}_{\text{SRC}}^{\text{kin}}(\rho), \quad (21)$$

where $i = \text{NL}, \text{DD}$. The expressions for the total symmetry energy $\mathcal{S}_i(\rho)$ are given by the sum of Eqs. (12) and (14) for the NL model, or Eqs. (12) and (15) for the DD one, by using the formulae of case 1. Exactly the same expressions are found if the case 2 is taken into account, i. e., if the sum of Eqs. (18) and (19) is performed for the NL model, or the sum of Eqs. (18) and (20) is considered for the DD model. Finally, the kinetic part of the symmetry energy for the present case analysis, $\mathcal{S}_{\text{SRC}}^{\text{kin}}(\rho)$, is taken from Ref. [24] as

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{SRC}}^{\text{kin}}(\rho) = \left(2^{2/3} - 1 \right) \frac{3k_F^2}{10M} - \Delta\mathcal{S}^{\text{kin}}(\rho), \quad (22)$$

with

$$\Delta\mathcal{S}^{\text{kin}}(\rho) = \frac{c_0 k_F^{0,2}}{2M\pi^2} \left[\lambda \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0} \right)^{1/3} - \frac{8}{5} \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_0} \right)^{2/3} + \frac{3\rho}{5\lambda\rho_0} \right], \quad (23)$$

where the parameters $c_0 = 4.48$ and $\lambda = 2.75$ are also taken from Ref. [24].

III. RESULTS

Let’s start by revisiting the analysis of the correlation between the symmetry energy $\mathcal{S}_0 = \mathcal{S}(\rho_0)$ and its slope $L_0 = L(\rho_0)$, both at saturation density, whose data are shown respectively in columns 1 and 4 in Tables III, IV and V (that will be detailed latter) and are plotted in Fig. 1, where squares refer to those parametrizations which also satisfy the macroscopic stellar properties of $1.93 \leq M_{\text{max}}/M_\odot \leq 2.05$ from Refs. [3, 4]. This correlation has already been extensively investigated, for instance, in Refs. [19, 45–47] and only some of the points in Fig. 1 coincide with the overlap region of figure 2 in Ref. [45] (gray band of our Fig. 1). This means that the accepted range of values in Ref. [2] is broader than the overlap of conditions shown in Ref. [45], namely, the overlap among constraints from nuclear masses, neutron skin thickness of Sn isotopes, dipole polarizability of ^{208}Pb , giant dipole resonances, isotope diffusion in heavy ion collisions, astrophysical observations, and neutron matter constraints.




FIG. 1. Slope as a function of the symmetry energy for the CRMF models (all points). The gray band was extracted from Ref. [45]. The squares represent parametrizations satisfying also the neutron star mass constraint of Refs. [3, 4].

We next obtain the γ values by using Eq. (10) for some CRMF parametrizations and then also compare our values with the ranges proposed in Refs. [24, 25]. In our analysis, we assume that the potential part of the symmetry energy can be written as in Eq. (8). Here, not all CRMF parametrizations are analyzed, but instead, only those in which the deviation defined by $\Delta(\rho) = |\mathcal{S}_{\text{model}}^{\text{pot}}(\rho) - \mathcal{S}_{\text{approx.}}^{\text{pot}}(\rho)|/\mathcal{S}_{\text{model}}^{\text{pot}}(\rho)$ is less than a certain value, with $\mathcal{S}_{\text{approx.}}^{\text{pot}}(\rho) = \mathcal{S}_0^{\text{pot}}(\rho/\rho_0)^\gamma$, see Eq. (8). As for each case one has different values for γ , the function $\mathcal{S}_{\text{approx.}}^{\text{pot}}(\rho)$ exhibits different density dependences for the same parametrization. Therefore, each studied case produces different values of $\Delta(\rho)$ for the same parametrization. Since experimental values of γ were extracted at suprasaturation density regime, we decided to investigate

the values of $\Delta(\rho)$ at a range of $1 \leq \rho/\rho_0 \leq 4$, and define that only CRMF parametrizations, at this specific density range, presenting $\Delta \leq 15\%$ are taken into account in our study. By considering this analysis, we ensure a good agreement between the exact potential part of the symmetry energy, $S_{\text{exact}}^{\text{pot}}(\rho)$, of the CRMF parametrizations and the approximated form given in Eq. (8).

Our calculations were divided in the three different cases presented in Sec. 2. For each one, we construct a specific table where we use the symbol \checkmark to mark those models in which the constraint $1.93 \leq M_{\text{max}}/M_{\odot} \leq 2.05$ for the maximum neutron star mass is also satisfied, the symbol \square to mark those parametrizations presenting γ parameter in the range of $\gamma = 0.72 \pm 0.19$, and the symbol \boxtimes to identify parametrizations for which $\gamma = 0.25 \pm 0.05$.

We next make a distinction between the two first cases (1 and 2) and case 3. For the last one presented in Sec. 3.3, we have considered short-range correlations in the kinetic part of the symmetry energy. For cases 1 and 2 such an effect is not taken into account. For this reason, we compare in next subsections the obtained values for the γ parameter in cases 1 and 2 only with the experimental range of $\gamma = 0.72 \pm 0.19$, since such range was obtained without SRC effects, according to Ref. [25]. Furthermore, we name the parameters calculated from cases 1 and 2 respectively, as γ_1 and γ_2 .

For case 3, the γ parameter obtained with SRC effects is named γ_3 . It is compared only with the experimental range of $\gamma = 0.25 \pm 0.05$ because this range was proposed in Ref. [24] with SRC included in the analysis.

A. Case 1

The γ values calculated from case 1 (γ_1) are presented in Table III. From this table we notice only 7 parametrizations with γ_1 in the range of $\gamma = 0.72 \pm 0.19$. Furthermore, with data taken from columns 1, 4 and 7, we investigate possible correlations between γ_1 and the isovector quantities at the saturation density. The results are depicted in Fig. 2.

From Fig. 2(a), we observe a trend of linear correlation between γ_1 and S_0 . A quantitative measurement of such finding can be given by calculation of the Pearson's correlation coefficient, defined as in Ref. [51]. Two different quantities A and B are strongly correlated within a linear relationship the more the coefficient correlation $C(A, B)$ is near to 1, or -1 in the case of a negative linear dependence. In the case of the S_0 dependence of γ_1 , we found $C(S_0, \gamma_1) = 0.667$.

By performing the same study in the $\gamma_1 \times L_0$ data, we noticed a better linear correlation than in the previous case, since the correlation coefficient resulted in $C(L_0, \gamma_1) = 0.892$, see Fig. 2(b). Moreover, if we restrict our analysis only to the points corresponding to the models in which the neutron star mass constraint is satisfied (squares), we see that the linear correlation is

TABLE III. Symmetry energy and its slope, with the respective kinetic and potential parts, all of them at $\rho = \rho_0$, obtained from the case 1 analysis for the CRMF parametrizations presenting $\Delta(\rho) \leq 15\%$ at a density range of $1 \leq \rho/\rho_0 \leq 4$ (see main text). The meaning of symbols \checkmark and \square is also defined in the text.

Models	S_0 (MeV)	S_0^{kin} (MeV)	S_0^{pot} (MeV)	L_0 (MeV)	L_0^{kin} (MeV)	L_0^{pot} (MeV)	γ_1
BKA20 $\checkmark \square$	32.24	16.58	15.66	75.38	48.47	26.91	0.57
BKA22 $\checkmark \square$	33.17	17.44	15.73	78.79	52.12	26.67	0.57
BKA24 $\checkmark \square$	34.19	17.54	16.65	84.80	52.09	32.70	0.65
BSR8 \checkmark	31.08	17.47	13.61	60.25	52.78	7.47	0.18
BSR9 \checkmark	31.61	17.57	14.05	63.89	52.41	11.49	0.27
BSR10 \checkmark	32.72	17.63	15.09	70.83	53.09	17.74	0.39
BSR11 $\checkmark \square$	33.69	17.47	16.22	78.78	51.89	26.89	0.55
BSR12 \checkmark	34.00	17.47	16.53	77.90	52.30	25.60	0.52
BSR15	30.97	17.33	13.65	61.79	49.34	12.45	0.30
BSR16	31.24	17.35	13.90	62.33	49.41	12.92	0.31
BSR17	31.98	17.38	14.60	67.44	49.50	17.93	0.41
BSR18	32.74	17.39	15.35	72.65	49.48	23.17	0.50
BSR19 \square	33.78	17.40	16.38	79.47	49.52	29.96	0.61
BSR20 \square	34.54	17.40	17.14	88.03	49.10	38.93	0.76
FSU-IV	31.43	17.45	13.98	52.16	49.72	2.44	0.06
FSUGold	32.56	17.45	15.11	60.44	49.72	10.72	0.24
FSUGold4	31.40	17.37	14.03	51.74	49.43	2.31	0.05
FSUGZ03 \checkmark	31.54	17.57	13.98	63.98	52.40	11.58	0.28
FSUGZ06	31.18	17.35	13.83	62.42	49.42	13.00	0.31
IU-FSU \checkmark	31.30	17.94	13.36	47.21	54.42	-7.21	-0.18
G2* $\checkmark \square$	30.39	16.61	13.77	69.68	46.31	23.37	0.57
Z271s5	31.84	13.82	18.02	53.57	32.55	21.02	0.39
Z271s6	31.20	13.82	17.38	47.81	32.55	15.25	0.29




FIG. 2. γ_1 as a function of (a) symmetry energy, and (b) its slope, both at $\rho = \rho_0$, for the models displayed in Table III (all points). Squares represent parametrizations also satisfying the neutron star mass constraint of $1.93 \leq M_{\text{max}}/M_{\odot} \leq 2.05$ [3, 4]. The solid and dashed lines are fitting curves.

still stronger in comparison to the one exhibited with all points. The correlation coefficient for the square points in Fig. 2(b) is $C(L_0, \gamma_1) = 0.956$.

B. Case 2

The γ_2 values calculated here are presented in Table IV. Since in this case we have prevented the kinetic

part of the symmetry energy from any influence of the effective mass, and as a consequence of the scalar meson effects, one can see here that $\mathcal{S}_0^{kin} = k_F^0{}^2 / (6E_F^0)$ differs from each parametrization only due to the Fermi energy $E_F^0 = (k_F^0{}^2 + M^2)^{1/2}$ at the saturation point. As $k_F^0 = (3\pi^2\rho_0/2)^{1/3}$, and as for nuclear mean-field models the saturation density is well established closely around the value of $\rho_0 = 0.15 \text{ fm}^{-3}$, it becomes clear that the parametrizations analyzed according to Eqs. (18)-(20) present values of \mathcal{S}_0^{kin} in a very narrow band as one can see from Table IV. For the same reason, the kinetic part of the symmetry energy slope, L_0^{kin} , is also constrained to a small range. Also from Table IV, we see that for the case 2 analysis, a large number of parametrizations, namely, 20 of them, have γ_2 in the range of $\gamma = 0.72 \pm 0.19$.

TABLE IV. Symmetry energy and its slope, with the respective kinetic and potential parts, all of them at $\rho = \rho_0$, obtained from the case 2 analysis for the CRMF parametrizations presenting $\Delta(\rho) \leq 15\%$ at a density range of $1 \leq \rho/\rho_0 \leq 4$ (see main text). The meaning of symbols \checkmark and \square is also defined in the text.

Models	S_0 (MeV)	S_0^{kin} (MeV)	S_0^{pot} (MeV)	L_0 (MeV)	L_0^{kin} (MeV)	L_0^{pot} (MeV)	γ_2
BKA20 $\checkmark \square$	32.24	11.15	21.09	75.38	21.53	53.85	0.85
BKA22 $\checkmark \square$	33.17	11.21	21.96	78.79	21.64	57.15	0.87
BKA24 \checkmark	34.19	11.20	22.99	84.80	21.63	63.17	0.92
BSR8 $\checkmark \square$	31.08	11.19	19.88	60.25	21.62	38.64	0.65
BSR9 $\checkmark \square$	31.61	11.21	20.40	63.89	21.65	42.24	0.69
BSR10 $\checkmark \square$	32.72	11.22	21.50	70.83	21.66	49.17	0.76
BSR11 $\checkmark \square$	33.69	11.19	22.50	78.78	21.60	57.18	0.85
BSR12 $\checkmark \square$	34.00	11.22	22.78	77.90	21.66	56.24	0.82
BSR15 \square	30.97	11.13	19.85	61.79	21.49	40.30	0.68
BSR16 \square	31.24	11.13	20.11	62.33	21.50	40.83	0.68
BSR17 \square	31.98	11.17	20.81	67.44	21.57	45.87	0.73
BSR18 \square	32.74	11.14	21.59	72.65	21.52	51.13	0.79
BSR19 \square	33.78	11.19	22.60	79.47	21.60	57.87	0.85
BSR20	34.54	11.15	23.38	88.03	21.54	66.48	0.95
FSU-III \square	33.89	11.26	22.64	71.72	21.73	49.99	0.74
FSU-IV	31.43	11.26	20.17	52.16	21.73	30.43	0.50
FSUGold4	31.40	11.22	20.18	51.74	21.66	30.07	0.50
FSUGZ03 $\checkmark \square$	31.54	11.21	20.33	63.98	21.65	42.33	0.69
FSUGZ06 \square	31.18	11.14	20.04	62.42	21.51	40.92	0.68
G2* $\checkmark \square$	30.39	11.52	18.87	69.68	22.22	47.46	0.84
Z271s2 \square	34.08	11.27	22.81	76.62	21.75	54.87	0.80
Z271s3 \square	33.27	11.27	22.00	67.81	21.75	46.05	0.70
Z271s4 \square	32.53	11.27	21.26	60.18	21.75	38.43	0.60
Z271s5	31.84	11.27	20.57	53.57	21.75	31.82	0.52
Z271s6	31.20	11.27	19.93	47.81	21.75	26.05	0.44
DD-ME δ \checkmark	32.18	11.44	20.74	51.43	22.08	29.35	0.47

As a further study, we analyse here the effect of the absence of the scalar interaction in the kinetic parts of the symmetry energy and its slope in the possible correlations of γ_2 with \mathcal{S}_0 and L_0 . The results are shown in Fig. 3.

From this figure one can see that the trend of linear correlation between γ_2 and \mathcal{S}_0 is worse when compared with case 1, since in case 2 one has $C(\mathcal{S}_0, \gamma_2) = 0.639$. However, we see that the linear correlation $\gamma_2 \times L_0$ is favored when the kinetic parts of the symmetry energy and its slope are free from the scalar interaction effects. The correlation coefficient in this case is $C(L_0, \gamma_2) = 0.977$, a higher value than the corresponding one of the previous case, namely, $C(L_0, \gamma_1) = 0.892$.




FIG. 3. γ_2 as a function of (a) symmetry energy, and (b) its slope, both at $\rho = \rho_0$, for the models of Table IV (all points). Squares represent parametrizations also satisfying the neutron star mass constraint of $1.93 \leq M_{\text{max}}/M_\odot \leq 2.05$ [3, 4]. Solid lines: fitting curves.

C. Case 3

The use of Eqs. (21)-(23) along with Eq. (7), all of them evaluated at $\rho = \rho_0$, allows the calculation of γ_3 from the definition given in Eq. (10). The results are presented in Table V. In our procedure, only the sum of the kinetic and potential parts of the symmetry energy matters. This sum does not change, and we extract the potential part by subtracting from the total (exact) value, the kinetic part with SRC included, as indicated in Eq. (21).




FIG. 4. γ_3 as a function of (a) symmetry energy, and (b) its slope, both at $\rho = \rho_0$, for the models of Table V (all points). Squares represent parametrizations also satisfying the neutron star mass constraint of $1.93 \leq M_{\text{max}}/M_\odot \leq 2.05$ [3, 4]. Solid lines: fitting curves.

From Table V we see that $\mathcal{S}_{\text{SRC},0}^{\text{kin}}$ has a negative value around -9.3 MeV for all parametrizations. Such a feature is a direct consequence of the short-range correla-

TABLE V. Symmetry energy and its slope, with the respective kinetic and potential parts, all of them at $\rho = \rho_0$, obtained from the case 3 analysis for the CRMF parametrizations presenting $\Delta(\rho) \leq 15\%$ at a density range of $1 \leq \rho/\rho_0 \leq 4$ (see main text). The meaning of symbols \checkmark and \boxtimes is also defined in the text.

Models	S_0 (MeV)	$S_{\text{SRC},0}^{\text{kin}}$ (MeV)	S_0^{pot} (MeV)	L_0 (MeV)	L_0^{kin} (MeV)	L_0^{pot} (MeV)	γ_3
BKA20 \checkmark	32.24	-9.31	41.55	75.38	21.21	54.16	0.43
BKA22 \checkmark	33.17	-9.36	42.53	78.79	21.33	57.46	0.45
BKA24 \checkmark	34.19	-9.35	43.54	84.80	21.31	63.48	0.49
BSR8 \checkmark	31.08	-9.35	40.43	60.25	21.30	38.95	0.32
BSR9 \checkmark	31.61	-9.37	40.98	63.89	21.34	42.55	0.35
BSR10 \checkmark	32.72	-9.37	42.09	70.83	21.35	49.48	0.39
BSR11 \checkmark	33.69	-9.34	43.03	78.78	21.29	57.49	0.44
BSR12 \checkmark	34.00	-9.37	43.37	77.90	21.35	56.55	0.43
BSR15	30.97	-9.29	40.26	61.79	21.17	40.62	0.34
BSR16	31.24	-9.30	40.54	62.33	21.18	41.15	0.34
BSR17	31.98	-9.33	41.31	67.44	21.25	46.18	0.37
BSR18	32.74	-9.31	42.04	72.65	21.20	51.45	0.41
BSR19	33.78	-9.34	43.13	79.47	21.29	58.19	0.45
BSR20	34.54	-9.31	43.85	88.03	21.22	66.80	0.51
FSU-III	33.89	-9.40	43.30	71.72	21.43	50.30	0.39
FSU-IV \boxtimes	31.43	-9.40	40.83	52.16	21.43	30.73	0.25
FSUGold	32.56	-9.40	41.96	60.44	21.43	39.01	0.31
FSUGold4 \boxtimes	31.40	-9.37	40.77	51.74	21.35	30.38	0.25
FSUGZ03 \checkmark	31.54	-9.37	40.91	63.98	21.34	42.64	0.35
FSUGZ06	31.18	-9.30	40.48	62.42	21.19	41.24	0.34
IU-FSU \checkmark \boxtimes	31.30	-9.67	40.97	47.21	22.04	25.17	0.20
G2* \checkmark	30.39	-9.63	40.02	69.68	21.94	47.74	0.40
Z271s2	34.08	-9.41	43.49	76.62	21.45	55.18	0.42
Z271s3	33.27	-9.41	42.68	67.81	21.45	46.36	0.36
Z271s4	32.53	-9.41	41.94	60.18	21.45	38.74	0.31
Z271s5 \boxtimes	31.84	-9.41	41.25	53.57	21.45	32.12	0.26
Z271s6 \boxtimes	31.20	-9.41	40.61	47.81	21.45	26.36	0.22
DD-ME δ \checkmark \boxtimes	32.18	-9.56	41.75	51.43	21.79	29.64	0.24

tions between proton-neutron pairs in symmetric nuclear matter introduced in Ref. [24], that produced the expressions presented in Eqs. (22)-(23). Such a negative value for S_0^{kin} of the CRMF parametrizations is indeed consistent with the range of -10 ± 7.5 MeV found by the authors [24] through the analysis of data from free proton-to-neutron ratios measured in intermediate energy nucleus-nucleus collisions.

We also see from Table V that the introduction of short-range correlations produces 6 parametrizations with γ_3 in the range of $\gamma = 0.25 \pm 0.05$.

In Fig. 4, we also investigate the γ_3 correlations. It is clear from this figure that the linear dependence between γ_3 and the isovector bulk parameters is still more favored when the short-range correlations are included in the CRMF parametrizations. The correlation coefficients obtained in this case are the closest to the unity, namely, $C(S_0, \gamma_3) = 0.689$ and $C(L_0, \gamma_3) = 0.994$ in comparison with the respective quantities regarding the cases 1 and 2.

D. Comments about the results

Regarding the correlations found mainly between γ and L_0 , we remark that such result is not trivial, and the reason can be given from an analysis of Eq. (10). From such equation we can write:

$$\gamma = \alpha L_0 + \beta, \quad (24)$$

with $\alpha = 1/(3S_0^{\text{pot}})$ and $\beta = -L_0^{\text{kin}}/(3S_0^{\text{pot}})$, i. e., a linear correlation between γ and L_0 is obtained if α and β are (ideally) constant numbers. In our study, we investigate whether L_0^{kin} and S_0^{pot} are close enough to constants for the sets of parametrization studied in each case. If this is the case, variations $\Delta\alpha$ and $\Delta\beta$ are close to zero. Since for each case studied we have the highest and lowest values of S_0^{pot} and L_0^{kin} , it is possible to calculate $\Delta\alpha = \frac{1}{3(S_0^{\text{pot}})_{\text{high}}} - \frac{1}{3(S_0^{\text{pot}})_{\text{low}}}$, and

$\Delta\beta = -\frac{(L_0^{\text{kin}})_{\text{high}}}{3(S_0^{\text{pot}})_{\text{high}}} + \frac{(L_0^{\text{kin}})_{\text{low}}}{3(S_0^{\text{pot}})_{\text{low}}}$. The absolute values of such calculations are shown in Table VI, and as one can see, $\Delta\alpha$ and $\Delta\beta$ are decreasing quantities if we analyse such numbers from case 1 to 3. These behaviors explain the increasing coefficient correlation shown in Figs. 2 to 4.

TABLE VI. Absolute values of $\Delta\alpha$ and $\Delta\beta$. Calculations for the three different cases analyzed.

case	$ \Delta\alpha $ (MeV $^{-1}$)	$ \Delta\beta $
1	0.0064	0.756
2	0.0034	0.085
3	0.0007	0.022

This result is a consequence of the data previously presented in Tables III, IV and V. From these tables, one can see that the values of L_0^{kin} and S_0^{pot} are closer to a constant value in case 3 than in case 2. Also, these values are closer to a certain constant value in case 2 than in case 1.

One can see from such a table that the closer results are obtained for the cases in which the scalar attractive interaction is not taken into account in the kinetic part of the symmetry energy, i. e., cases 2 and 3, being the last one the case in which $\Delta\alpha$ and $\Delta\beta$ are closer to zero.

As a direct application of this specific correlation, we also investigate whether γ_1 , γ_2 , and γ_3 obtained from the CRMF parametrizations in the three different cases studied and always calculated for symmetric nuclear matter, also correlates with neutron star radii. The motivation of such study comes from the results presented in Ref. [52], in which authors found that for a class of 42 relativistic and Skyrme parametrizations, L_0 linearly depends on $R_{1.0}$ and $R_{1.4}$, namely, the radii of neutron stars presenting $M_{\text{star}} = M_{\odot}$ and $1.4M_{\odot}$, respectively. The $R_{1.0}$ and $R_{1.4}$ dependence of γ_1 , γ_2 , γ_3 related to those CRMF parametrizations analyzed here is shown in Fig. 5. In order to obtain stellar macroscopic properties, the same CRMF parametrizations are used, but now the models are subject to matter neutrality and β -equilibrium.

In order to generate the neutron star radii, we have joined the hadronic matter EoS from the CRMF parametrizations with those for electrons and muons. After that, the conditions of charge neutrality and chemical equilibrium were taken into account and the Baym-Pethick-Sutherland (BPS) equation of state [53] for low densities was added to the EoS for hadrons and leptons. The resulting EoS was used as input to the Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff equations [54]. We address the




FIG. 5. γ_1 , γ_2 , and γ_3 as a function of the $R_{1.0}$ and $R_{1.4}$ neutron star radii for the CRMF parametrizations (all points). Squares represent parametrizations also satisfying the constraint of $1.93 \leq M_{\max}/M_{\odot} \leq 2.05$ [3, 4].

reader to details regarding such calculations to Ref. [55], for instance.

From Fig. 5, we can conclude that the CRMF parametrizations also present a linear behavior concerning γ_1 , γ_2 , γ_3 and the neutron star radii. This result is entirely compatible with the findings of Ref. [52]. In that paper, a linear correlation between L_0 and the radii was found, and since in our study we have found a linear dependence for γ_1 , γ_2 , γ_3 and L_0 , according to Eq. (24), a direct consequence is the linear behavior described in Fig. 5. Also as in Ref. [52], the correlations are stronger for the $R_{1.0}$ neutron star radius as the correlation coefficients $C(R_{1.0}, \gamma)$ point out. Finally, as observed along all investigations, the linear dependence is intensified in cases 2 and 3 in which the effects of the scalar interaction are absent from the kinetic part of the symmetry energy.

Another point we remark here concerns the gray band of Fig. 1 for the CRMF models in the different cases studied. In order to do that, we start by redrawing such a figure for the different models that reproduce

$\gamma = 0.25 \pm 0.05$, panel (a), and $\gamma = 0.72 \pm 0.19$, panel (b) in Fig. 6.




FIG. 6. Slope as a function of the symmetry energy for the models that produce the (a) lower and (b) higher γ ranges discussed in the last section. The gray band was extracted from Ref. [45]. Orange points represent those parametrizations in which the neutron star mass constraint of $1.93 \leq M_{\max}/M_{\odot} \leq 2.05$ [3, 4] is verified.

It is worth noting that the CRMF parametrizations for which we have obtained the γ parameters from case 3 are more compatible with the gray band proposed in Ref. [45], i. e., the short-range correlations effects induce the CRMF parametrizations to present the γ parameter inside the range of $\gamma = 0.25 \pm 0.05$, simultaneously being consistent with the overlap conditions of Ref. [45] obtained from many experimental and observational data. For such a case, 6 parametrizations are inside the overlap band, namely, IU-FSU, FSU-IV, FSUGold4, Z271s5, Z271s6, and DD-ME δ , with 2 of them, IU-FSU and DD-ME δ , also satisfying the neutron star mass constraint of $1.93 \leq M_{\max}/M_{\odot} \leq 2.05$ [3, 4] and two of them, Z271s5 and Z271s6 yielding critical parameters close to the existing proposition of experimental values, according to the findings of Ref. [5].

IV. SUMMARY

In summary, our calculations have shown that, independently of the choice made to obtain the γ values (case 1, 2 or 3) for the CRMF models, a trend of linear correlation is observed between γ_1 , γ_2 , γ_3 and S_0 , and a more clear linear relationship is established regarding γ_1 , γ_2 , γ_3 and the slope of the symmetry energy at the saturation density, L_0 . In cases 2 and 3, the last correlation is still more pronounced. Such effect arises due to the absence of the attractive interaction in the kinetic part of the symmetry energy. Furthermore, the short-range correlations introduced in the case 3 analysis intensify the linear L_0 dependence of γ_3 as seen in Fig. 4(b). These results can be used to determine other linear cor-

relations of γ_1 , γ_2 , γ_3 and the neutron star radii of $R_{1.0}$ and $R_{1.4}$, as displayed in Fig. 5. Finally, specifically for case 3, two specific parametrizations, namely, IU-FSU and DD-ME δ are shown to be compatible with the range of $\gamma = 0.25 \pm 0.05$ [24], and simultaneously consistent with the neutron star mass constraint of Refs. [3, 4], and other two, Z271s5 and Z271s6, simultaneously compatible with the range of $\gamma = 0.25 \pm 0.05$ [24] and with probable critical parameters experimental values [5]. The four parametrizations are consistent with the overlap band for the $L_0 \times S_0$ region described in Ref. [45], see Fig. 6.

As a final remark, we remind the reader that we have only analyzed symmetric matter in this study for the calculation of the γ values, but the potential difference for neutrons and protons in neutron-rich matter and their density dependence, for instance, can also be calculated. However, the results could not be compared with the existing γ values. Furthermore, if we also want to investigate the momentum dependence in asymmetric matter, single particle potentials, which are different for neutrons and protons, have to be taken into account, see

Ref. [56, 57]. To obtain this kind of dependence, one would need either a theory that uses non-local interactions or a Thomas-Fermi calculation and both approaches are out of the scope of the present work.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is a part of the project INCT-FNA Proc. No. 464898/2014-5 and was partially supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), Brazil under grants 300602/2009-0 and 306786/2014-1. E. P. acknowledges support from the Israel Science Foundation and thanks the Brazilian Physical Society and the organizers of the XXXVIII RTFNB (nuclear physics annual meeting) for the invitation in 2015, when this collaboration started. O. H. acknowledges the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science, Office of nuclear physics program under award number DE-FG02-94ER40818.

-
- [1] M. Dutra, O. Lourenço, S. S. Avancini, B. V. Carlson, A. Delfino, D. P. Menezes, C. Providência, S. Typel, and J. R. Stone, *Phys. Rev. C* **90**: 055203 (2014).
 - [2] M. Dutra, O. Lourenço and D. P. Menezes, *Phys. Rev. C* **93**: 025806 (2016); *Phys. Rev. C* **94**: 049901(E) (2016).
 - [3] P. B. Demorest, T. Pennucci, S. M. Ransom, M. S. E. Roberts, and J. W. T. Hessels, *Nature* **467**: 1081 (2010).
 - [4] J. Antoniadis, P. C. C. Freire, N. Wex *et al.*: *Science* **340**: 448 (2013).
 - [5] O. Lourenço, M. Dutra and D. P. Menezes, *Phys. Rev. C* **95**: 065212 (2017).
 - [6] G. Bertsch and P. J. Siemens, *Phys. Lett. B* **126**: 9 (1983); J. Margueron and P. Chomaz, *Phys. Rev. C* **67**: 041602 (2003); C. Ducoin, Ph. Chomaz, and F. Gulminelli, *Nucl. Phys. A* **771**: 68 (2006).
 - [7] H. Müller and B. D. Serot, *Phys. Rev. C* **52**: 2072 (1995).
 - [8] Ph. Chomaz, C. Colonna, and J. Randrup, *Phys. Rep.* **389**: 263 (2004).
 - [9] J. B. Silva, O. Lourenço, A. Delfino, J. S. Sá Martins, M. Dutra, *Phys. Lett. B* **664**: 246, (2008).
 - [10] V. Vovchenko, D. V. Anchishkin, and M. I. Gorenstein, *Phys. Rev. C* **91**: 064314 (2015).
 - [11] V. Vovchenko, D. V. Anchishkin, M. I. Gorenstein, and R. V. Poberezhnyuk, *Phys. Rev. C* **92**: 054901 (2015).
 - [12] V. Vovchenko, *Phys. Rev. C* **96**: 015206 (2017).
 - [13] M. Baldo, G. F. Burgio, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **91**: 203 (2016).
 - [14] C. J. Horowitz and J. Piekarewicz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**: 5647 (2001).
 - [15] S. S. Avancini, J. R. Marinelli, D. P. Menezes, M. M. W. Moraes and C. Providência, *Phys. Rev. C* **75**: 055805 (2007).
 - [16] L. L. Lopes and D. P. Menezes, *Braz. Jour. Phys.* **44**: 774 (2014).
 - [17] R. Cavagnoli, D. P. Menezes and C. Providência, *Phys. Rev. C* **84**: 065810 (2011).
 - [18] P. K. Panda, A. M. S. Santos, D. P. Menezes and C. Providência, *Phys. Rev. C* **85**: 055802 (2012).
 - [19] C. Providência *et al.*: *Eur. Phys. J. A* **50**: 44 (2014).
 - [20] H. Pais, A. Sulaksono, B. K. Agrawal, and C. Providência, *Phys. Rev. C* **93**: 045802 (2016).
 - [21] S. S. Avancini, L. Brito, J. R. Marinelli, D. P. Menezes, M. M. W. de Moraes, C. Providência and A. M. Santos, *Phys. Rev. C* **79**: 035804 (2009).
 - [22] M. B. Tsang, Yingxun Zhang, P. Danielewicz, M. Famiano, Zhuxia Li, W. G. Lynch, and A. W. Steiner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**: 122701 (2009).
 - [23] Andrew W. Steiner, James M. Lattimer, and Edward F. Brown, *Astrophys J.* **722**: 33 (2010).
 - [24] Or Hen, Bao-An Li, Wen-Jun Guo, L.B. Weinstein and Eliezer Piasetzky, *Phys. Rev. C* **91**: 025803 (2015).
 - [25] P. Russotto *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **94**: 034608 (2016).
 - [26] J. Meng, H. Toki, S. G. Zhou, S. Q. Zhang, W. H. Long, L. S. Geng, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **57**: 470 (2006).
 - [27] B. K. Agrawal, *Phys. Rev. C* **81**: 034323 (2010).
 - [28] S. K. Dhiman, R. Kumar, and B. K. Agrawal, *Phys. Rev. C* **76**: 045801 (2007).
 - [29] B.-J. Cai, L.-W. Chen, *Phys. Rev. C* **85**: 024302 (2012).
 - [30] B. G. Todd-Rutel and J. Piekarewicz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**: 122501 (2005).
 - [31] J. Piekarewicz and S. P. Weppner, *Nucl. Phys. A* **778**: 10 (2006).
 - [32] R. Kumar, B. K. Agrawal, and S. K. Dhiman, *Phys. Rev. C* **74**: 034323 (2006).
 - [33] A. Sulaksono and T. Mart, *Phys. Rev. C* **74**: 045806 (2006).
 - [34] F. J. Fattoyev, C. J. Horowitz, J. Piekarewicz, and G. Shen, *Phys. Rev. C* **82**: 055803 (2010).
 - [35] C. J. Horowitz and J. Piekarewicz, *Phys. Rev. C* **66**: 055803 (2002).
 - [36] T. Klähn, *et al.*: *Phys. Rev. C* **74**: 035802 (2006).

- [37] S. Typel and H. H. Wolter, Nucl. Phys. A **656**: 331 (1999).
- [38] T. Gaitanos, M. Di Toro, S. Typel, V. Baran, C. Fuchs, V. Greco, and H. H. Wolter, Nucl. Phys. A **732**: 24 (2004).
- [39] X. Roca-Maza, X. Viñas, M. Centelles, P. Ring, and P. Schuck, Phys. Rev. C **84**: 054309 (2011).
- [40] J. J. Rusnak and R. J. Furnstahl, Nucl. Phys. A **627**: 495 (1997).
- [41] B. A. Nikolaus, T. Hoch, and D. G. Madland, Phys. Rev. C **46**: 1757 (1992).
- [42] D. G. Madland, T. J. Bürvenich, J. A. Maruhn, P.-G. Reinhard, Nucl. Phys. A **741**: 52 (2004).
- [43] O. Lourenço, M. Dutra, A. Delfino, and R. L. P. G. Amaral, Int. Jour. Mod. Phys. E, **16**: 3037 (2007).
- [44] T. Niksic, D. Vretenar, and P. Ring, Prog. in Part. and Nucl. Phys. **66**: 519 (2011).
- [45] J. M. Lattimer and Y. Lim, Astrophys. J. **51**: 771 (2013).
- [46] *Neutron Star Crust*: editors Carlos Bertulani and Jorge Pieckarewicz, Nova Science Publishers, 2012, New York.
- [47] B. M. Santos, M. Dutra, O. Lourenço, and A. Delfino, Phys. Rev. C **90**: 035203 (2014); **92**: 015210 (2015).
- [48] R. Subedi *et. al.*: Science **320**: 1476 (2008).
- [49] O. Hen *et al.*: Science **346**: 614 (2014).
- [50] O. Hen, G. A. Miller, E. Piasetzky, and L. B. Weinstein, to appear in Rev. Mod. Phys (2017).
- [51] S. Brandt, *Data Analysis: Statistical and Computational Methods for Scientists and Engineers*: 4th ed. (Springer, New York, 2014).
- [52] N. Alam, B. K. Agrawal, M. Fortin, H. Pais, C. Providência, Ad. R. Raduta, and A. Sulaksono, Phys. Rev. C **94**: 052801(R) (2016).
- [53] G. Baym, C. Pethick, P. Sutherland, Astrophys. J. **170**: 299 (1971).
- [54] J. R. Oppenheimer, G. M. Volkoff, Phys. Rev. **33**: 374 (1939).
- [55] N. K. Glendenning, *Compact Stars*: 2nd ed. (Springer, New York, 2000); P. Haensel, A. Y. Potekhin, and D. G. Yakovlev, *Neutron Stars, Equation of State and Structure* (Springer, New York, 2006).
- [56] Bao-An Li, W. Udo Schröder (Eds.), *Isospin Physics in Heavy-Ion Collisions at Intermediate Energies*: Nova Science Publishers, Huntington, NY, 2001.
- [57] Bao-An Li, Champak B. Das, Subal Das Gupta, Charles Gale, Nuc. Phys. A **735**: 563 (2004).